a source for illuminating said sample with radiation within a first band of wavelengths, wherein said first band of wavelengths excites regions within said sample causing said regions to emit radiation within a second band of wavelengths;

an interferometer for spectrally resolving said wavelengths within said second band of wavelengths, wherein said interferometer creates an interferogram of said sample that is superimposed on an image of said sample transmitted by said interferometer, wherein said interferometer includes:

at least two turning mirrors; and

one polarizing beam splitter,

wherein said polarizing beam splitter substantially reflects a first polarization and substantially transmits a second preferred polarization;

a detector array, wherein said sample and said interferogram of said sample are imaged on said detector array, wherein said detector array outputs a plurality of signals corresponding to an intensity at each pixel of said array; and

a processor coupled to said detector array and coupled to a monitor, said processor displaying an image of said sample on said monitor.

REMARKS

Claims 12-13 and 23-26 are pending.

Claims 12-13 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,007,996) in view of Cabib et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,517) and Hock (U.S. Patent No. 3,822,942).

This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because the Examiner believed that it recited a broad recitation (one polarizing beamsplitter) and also a narrow range or limitation (preferentially reflects .... preferentially transmits). However, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants were using the terms preferentially to indicate that the beamsplitter substantially reflects a first polarization and substantially transmits a second preferred polarization. Thus, to make claim 12 more clear, Applicants